



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

**RECEIVED**

JUL 14 2004

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

JGJR . 06-04

Paper No: 23

COOPER & DUNHAM  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK NY 10112

**COPY MAILED**

JUN 29 2004

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Kast, et al  
Application No. 08/170,344  
Filed: 30 March, 1994  
Attorney Docket No.: 45113/RDK/AG

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 28 May, 2004, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), alleging unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

**NOTES:**

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."
- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.
- (3) The mailing address set forth on the petition is different from that of record. There is no indication that Petitioner herein ever Noticed the Office of a Change of Address as to the instant matter. If Petitioner desires to receive future correspondence at the new address, the appropriate Notice must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to Petitioner. However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

### BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply to the final Office action mailed on 14 June, 1996, with reply due absent extension of time on or before Monday, 16 September, 1996;
- the application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 14 September, 1996;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 23 January, 1997;
- with the instant petition, Petitioner Robert D. Katz (Reg. No. 30,141):
  - makes a statement of--but provides no documentary support for the allegation of--non-receipt of the final Office action and the Notice of Abandonment;
  - evidences no inquiry with copies of status inquiries or receipt cards reflecting such;
  - fails to satisfy regulatory requirements (under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), as filed, for a terminal disclaimer);
  - (in light of the obvious difference in addresses) makes no showing of timely Notice to the Office of Change of Address.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>1</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>2</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>3</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>4</sup>

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>5</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>6</sup> And petitions calling upon the authority of the Commissioner to act, such as that under 37 C.F.R. §1.181,<sup>7</sup> require diligence as to their filing—i.e., the petition must be filed within two months of

---

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>3</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

<sup>6</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>7</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.181 provide:  
**§ 1.181 Petition to the Commissioner.**

(a) Petition may be taken to the Commissioner:

(1) From any action or requirement of any examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in the *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to the court;

(2) In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by or reviewed by the Commissioner; and

(3) To invoke the supervisory authority of the Commissioner in appropriate circumstances. For petitions in interferences, see § 1.644.

(b) Any such petition must contain a statement of the facts involved and the point or points to be reviewed and the action requested. Briefs or memoranda, if any, in support thereof should accompany or be embodied in the petition; and where facts are to be proven, the proof in the form of affidavits or declarations (and exhibits, if any) must accompany the petition.

(c) When a petition is taken from an action or requirement of an examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in the *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding, it may be required that there have been a proper request for reconsideration (§ 1.111) and a repeated action by the examiner. The examiner may be directed by the Commissioner to furnish a written statement, within a specified time, setting forth the reasons for his or her decision upon the matters averred in the petition, supplying a copy to the petitioner.

(d) Where a fee is required for a petition to the Commissioner the appropriate section of this part will so indicate. If any required fee does not accompany the petition, the petition will be dismissed.

(e) Oral hearing will not be granted except when considered necessary by the Commissioner.

(f) The mere filing of a petition will not stay any period for reply that may be running against the application, nor act as a stay of other proceedings. Any petition under this part not filed within two months of the mailing date of the action or notice from which relief is requested may be dismissed as untimely, except as otherwise provided. This two-month period is not extendable.

(g) The Commissioner may delegate to appropriate Patent and Trademark Office officials the determination of petitions.  
[24 Fed. Reg. 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 34 Fed. Reg. 18857, Nov. 26, 1969; paras. (d) and (g), 47 Fed. Reg. 41278, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (a), 49 Fed. Reg. 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (f) revised, 65 Fed. Reg. 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective

the action complained of.

Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

A grantable petition alleging unintentional delay requires: (a) a petition and fee, (b) a proper reply, (c) a statement of unintentional delay supported by further explanation and documentary evidence where required by the Commissioner, and (d) a terminal disclaimer and fee. Items "c" and "d" are absent here.

Petitioner makes no evidentiary showing as to how the instant matter went abandoned—and remained so for more than seven (7) years and eight (8) months before Petitioner sought to revive the application. This showing should include, but is not limited to, docket records, tickler reports, and file jacket entries for this application, and documents regarding the alleged cause of the delay and copies of any documents referred to in Petitioner's statements as to the cause of the delay are required. All the causes which contributed to the abandonment must be presented and supported with appropriate evidence.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, Petitioner fails to satisfy the basic documentary requirement of a terminal disclaimer (and fee) on filing of the instant petition.

Thus, Petitioner fails to satisfy his burden under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) must be and hereby is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: (Effective 1 May, 2003)<sup>9</sup>  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

---

Nov. 7, 2000; paras. (a) and (c) revised. 65 Fed. Reg. 76756, Dec. 7, 2000, effective Feb. 5, 2001]

<sup>8</sup> The showing must also enumerate the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly. The showing can be verified by using the attached petition form which includes a declaration according to 37 C.F.R. §1.68. Statements from all persons who contributed to the delay are also required.

<sup>9</sup> To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

By FAX: (703) 872-9306 (IFW Formal Filings)  
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Lobby/Room 1B03  
Crystal Plaza Two  
2011 South Clark Place  
Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

cc:  
COOPER & DUNHAM  
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK NY 10036